FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-123-S
Wednesday
28 June 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-123-S *28 June 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Congress Proceedings Continue 30 May 1
Sixth Session *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 1

Congress Proceedings Continue 30 May

Sixth Session

18001165 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 4-7

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]

Sixth Session

30 May 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1000.

USSR People's Deputy R.N. Nishanov, presiding.

Nishanov: Dear comrade people's deputies! We are continuing the work of the congress. Let us turn to the next question on the agenda of our congress: "On the Basic Directions for the Domestic and Foreign Policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." The floor is given to Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, for a report. (Applause).

(The report was published in the previous issue.) [The translation of Gorbachev's report published in the 31 May IZVESTIYA appeared on pages 51-65 of the 16 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

Nishanov: The report having been completed, perhaps we can agree with the opinion, to submit questions in written form. Are there any objections? The motion is accepted. A 30-minute break is declared. (Break).

Nishanov: Comrade deputies, please sit down. Take your seats. Let us move on to discussion of the report. The floor is granted to Deputy Sergey Tikhonovich Melekhin of Sverdlovsk Oblast, and Comrade Yefrem Yevsevich Sokolov is to prepare himself.

S.T. Melekhin, operator at the Nizhnetagilskiy V.I. Lenin Metallurgical Combine, RSFSR, Sverdlovsk Oblast, Nizhnyy Tagil (from the USSR Trade Unions): Comrade deputies! The report by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev provides an analysis and evaluation of the urgent problems we are to solve in this forum. We are dividing them up. By authority of the deputies from the trade unions I would also like to speak about the most critical social problems.

What is troubling the Soviet people most of all? One of the most acute problems is—housing. About 5,000,000 people currently have dilapidated, emergency or barrack-type housing. One has to wait in long lines for 10-15 years for improved housing conditions. Soviet and party organs are taking measures to correct the situation. The working collectives are doing a great deal, and there is a government resolution. However, in spite of this, the average annual increase in introduction of housing for the 3 years of the 5-year plan amounts to only 15 percent. In our opinion this is clearly inadequate, inasmuch as at that rate, we shall not solve the housing problem by the year 2000. Our mandate to the new government, and to you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, is to search out new possibilities for unconditionally carrying out the planned program—at the same time observing social and regional fairness, so that housing would be constructed on an equal basis throughout the country, and not concentrated in a single city somewhere.

Along with the problem of where to live, the deputies from the trade unions give equal standing to the problem of what to live on. Nearly 40,000,000 Soviet citizens of which the report spoke have an income of less than 75 rubles. We are now saying that these people are living on the edge of poverty; but we are not saying how one can live beyond this line itself. Pensioners, families with lots of children, invalids, and students belong to this category. Moreover, it is very disturbing that the acuteness of the problem is growing like a snowball rolling down a mountain—the closer it gets to the bottom, the bigger it is. For we all know full well how persistently prices are rising and how vitally needed articles are disappearing from the store shelves with equal persistence. A portion of them turn up later in the hands of people who trade for them for fabulous prices at the market. Another portion fall into the category of contract prices, which devour the family budget no less painfully. Finally, the third portion consists of such goods as soap, detergents and so on, which disappear without a trace.

The cooperatives are contributing as best they can to the formation of the snowball. The Soviet people had anticipated that efficient operators, by virtue of manufacturing goods the people need, or by raising cattle, would replenish the needs of the market. But that seems all too simple. Goods are being bought up wholesale and retail according to state prices and are then offered for sale—but then at cooperative prices. I can understand how a cooperator buys a calf or a piglet, raises it, and offers it on the market. Naturally, it is more expensive, because of his expenses; but that is, comrades, additional meat. There are losses, for example, at an enterprise. An enterprising person enters a contract, organizes production of goods in high demand, and offers them for sale. Thus, in both cases, it is a question of bringing additional goods to the market. But the reality of the cooperative movement of today is so distorted, that in many cases it arouses the just indignation of the people.

Nor is the idea of contract prices well understood. Who is it that makes contracts with someone behind the backs of the consumers and at the expense of the family budget? Quite often we see the following picture: A person comes into a store and notes that a kilogram of cucumbers cost 2.50 the day before, and 4.50 today. To the reasonable question, why, the salesperson responds, as a rule: "Read, it says the prices are contracted." One

would think that this is not a gap, but a gate flung wide open, through which certain business managers are trying to recover their business affairs. There is no choice: Take it, or leave it.

On one hand there is the price increase—inflation; on the other, the minimum wage has not been re-examined for 17 years. As before, the pensions of the majority of the veterans are at a low level. Finally, no mechanism exists to tie in price increases and inflation with an increase in wages, pensions, benefits, and stipends. There is a great obligation for state loans, for which veterans above all should be considered, who could by means of such loans restore their budget. Under these conditions the new Law on Pensions takes on special significance. We must find a means, as early as the coming year, to raise the minimum amounts of pensions.

We must make special mention, comrades, of our Soviet women. We say a lot of eloquent words about them, but thus far there is no progress. We are talking about improving their working conditions; relieving women from night shifts; increasing, upon their request, partly paid leave in order to look after their children; and offering them the opportunity for part-time work. But what are needed are ways to solve them. One would think that one of them would be—when enterprises or manufacturing plants are being reconstructed or new shops put into operation—normatives should be laid down in such a way that they would envisage the possibilty of women working less than a full day, or less than a full week; otherwise we will once again be drowning in appeals. Many deputies, and trade-union representatives among them, have been given a mandate by the voters—to radically improve medical services. Attempts have been made more than once to fundamentally improve them; however, thus far there are no tangible results. In this connection one cannot agree with the opinion of certain economists who are speaking out for expanding paid medical treatment, or with the opinion of Candidate of Medical Sciences, Comrade Kaplan, who proposed in PRAVDA (24 May) to pay for treatment at the expense of the enterprises. You yourselves understand, that in this case there can be no firm guarantees; for first of all an enterprise would transfer its profits to the state budget, a second portion to its next-higher authority, and only then will allot what is left to itself. Deputies from the trade unions insist on free medical services, and high quality as well. The question arises, where can one find the means. Comrades, they can be found. We are submitting a suggestion to the country's new government—to re-examine the distribution of the national income. The proportion for consumption and non-industrial construction in it must be increased to 86-87 percent.

We often have to listen to statements like, "There's not enough there"; or, "there's a shortage here." Well, with such management we will have to hear these "objective" arguments for a long time yet. Judge for yourselves, comrade deputies: There are more than 300,000 square meters of empty manufacturing space in our country. It would seem that, according to the logic of things, we should immediately install equipment there and put out the products the people need so badly. Instead, we start to erect more and more new boxes. Last year the number of new construction starts increased by 40 percent. Now uncompleted construction amounts to an enormous sum—150 billion rubles. Just try to imagine such a figure, and try to picture for a second, just how many burning problems of a social nature could be resolved, if these frozen assets could be applied to the needs of the people. It is painful to look at how manufacturing accommodations that have been erected but not completed are becoming dilapidated and spoiled; how the equipment rusts and becomes unusable—quite often imported equipment; and thus one wants to say—gold. But who is responsible for this, and what conclusions have been made? We cannot go on this way. The people's money has an altogether real owner—the people. Accordingly, instead of the existing system, which permits squandering, we need a system which permits sensibly utilizing the material valuables in the interests of the Soviet people. At its core there must be a sense of responsibility. The deputies from the trade unions have been authorized to submit a mandate to the government: In the next 2 years the amount of uncompleted construction must be reduced by 40-50 billion rubles. This is an altogether realistic task. These assets would be sufficient to introduce laws on pensions and leave, and to allocate the necessary funds to poor families.

A second proposal: To strive with great persistence to achieve a relaxation of international tensions, and on this basis continue to work for the reduction of military expenditures; moreover, in a reciprocal direction. This, too, will provide us additional billions of rubles.

We have already heard in the report, comrades, about the necessity to reduce the administrative apparat. In spite of repeated appeals and resolutions, its numbers are not declining; on they contrary, they are growing. Sensible reduction—this, comrades, is also a great reserve; and I stress, sensible; for just to issue an order and cite a number—that is only half the job. It must be determined sensibly, where and how much to reduce.

If I were to sum up all the proposals, it would be that there are billions of additonal rubles which could be directed toward solving social needs. In a word, comrades, the time has come for extensive public discussion of the widest variety of extraordinary programs for restoring the financial health of the economy and for radically improving matters in the social sphere. In order to prepare a draft for this problem it would be sensible to establish a special—I would say extraordinary—commission, either at the congress or at the Supreme Soviet, and give it the necessary authority and rights. I would like to emphasize once again, that the workers are expecting of our congress, and of the Supreme Soviet, practical solutions and concrete results, and we must prove worthy of their trust. We must act in such a way,

that our country will have more socialism; that in the future no one will ever have an opportunity to assert, or even say these words aloud here: "The past of our motherland was unpredictable."

Comrades! I have a proposal: that all the deputies choose a time during breaks in the work of our congress, pay a visit to Vladimir Ilich Lenin's tomb, and lay a wreath at the tomb and at the tomb of the unknown soldier. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov offers the floor to Deputy Sokolov. Deputy Masol is to get ready.

Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee (Kobrinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Brest Oblast): Dear comrades! Our difficult time is so compressed under the weight of problems inherited from the past or that have arisen in recent years that you have a very acute understanding of how vitally important and how vitally necessary everyone's personal responsibility for the fate of restructuring really is. One of the reasons why it has been marking time in a number of areas is that, in the intoxicating atmosphere and the stormy waves of democratization, the concepts of "organization," "responsibility," and "discipline" have become overshadowed and have begun to be forgotten in both lower and upper echelons.

At the meetings in the runup to the elections, working people rightly asked questions, even with some bewilderment: Why are the 27th CPSU Congress guidelines on changing investment policy and comprehensively developing a region, city, or enterprise not being implemented? Why are new plants still being built without housing and other sociocultural projects? Excessive enthusiasm for building production projects to the detriment of shaping the infrastructure willy-nilly creates the preconditions for ensuring that even newly commissioned plants operate, as a rule, on a one-shift basis, at half strength. In other words, it is continuing the worthless practice of dissipating and burying national resources and freezing fixed state assets. This is happening at a time when areas connected with vital questions of meeting people's basic needs require greater attention. And, in a number of cases, not simply vital but urgent. Such as the task of eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster, for example.

Time will not dull the pain in the hearts of people living in Belorussia, where 18 percent of agricultural land has been subjected to radioactive pollution. Whereas in the initial stages a union-level governmental commission was working on this problem, now its efforts are barely noticeable. In 3 years the commission has not been able to develop a convincing, properly thought out concept of a safe existence that will guarantee the health of future generations. In our opinion, the position here should be perfectly clear. People should not live in places where it is impossible to use the produce from their own land. This is not an area where we should try to economize.

Another natural question is why are decisions made by higher bodies so emasculated by the time they actually reach departmental offices that there is hardly anything left of them? Why is it that in these very same offices USSR laws are sometimes manipulated to such an extent that you find yourself exclaiming in spite of yourself: "Was there really a law?" Now, in the conditions of democracy and socialist pluralism of opinions, exactingness must be valued as never before—and valued everywhere: From the CPSU Central Committee to party groups, from the USSR Council of Ministers to labor collectives. Recently they, the labor collectives, have become a subject of close attention for those who are trying—by hiding behind restructuring slogans and pouring scorn upon law and order—to sow hatred and enmity between peoples and whip up social and political tension. It is now quite obvious that in some places forces are taking shape which have consciously chosen a path of confrontation, destabilization of the situation, and discrediting of the party line. Confrontation is not simply irresponsible, it is socially dangerous, because it distracts people from real work and undermines their moral world by forcing out warmth, amicability, and a respectful attitude to others regardless of their social status, nationality, or religious beliefs.

Perhaps our congress should adopt a special political resolution on increasing Soviet citizens' responsibility for the fate of restructuring. It would be advisable for this resolution to clearly stipulate that genuine democracy is possible only within the framework of the law and with the supremacy of the law. Only the law, which reflects the will of the people, can serve as a criterion of responsibility. The public has rightly raised the question of changing the correlation between the law and the state and eliminating the primacy of the state over the law. But alongside the concept of a "law-abiding state" there must definitely stand another concept—the "law-abiding citizen."

The development of the cooperative movement and individual labor activity sometimes attracts not only honest workers but also various swindlers and people on the make. Essentially, these people are also opponents of restructuring, who are undermining useful initiatives and trying to incline public opinion toward clearly leftist positions and disorder. As far as they are concerned, the humanization of justice primarily means protection of those who break the law. Now the pages of some newspapers and journals are plastered with reports from places not so very remote—from the world of criminals and drug addicts. What is more, sympathy and charity are mainly shown to those who have committed a crime, while virtually no mention is made of their victims. Yes, we are in favor of the humanization and democratization of legislation. But this humanization and democratization must have one aim only—to protect honest people and not those who encroach on our rights and freedoms, on citizens' personal interests, and on the interests of society. Is this not the main moral principle of a rule-of-law state?

The newly elected USSR Supreme Soviet is faced with the task of adopting the law "On the Basic Principles of Criminal Legislation," and it is important to ensure in this respect that the opinions of broad sections of the public are taken into account. I would, incidentally, like to point out that our country has not developed the institution of forecasting legislation, studying the effectiveness of current legal norms, and seeking new ones. This leads, on the one hand, to the accumulation of a vast number of dead laws and, on the other, to an absence of legal backing for developing social relations.

Each stage of restructuring sets us a new test. But there is one test which society must pass as soon as possible. I am referring to improvement of the economy. While supporting the extensive measures to improve the economic situation contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, I feel it necessary to voice a number of considerations.

The process of achieving a healthier economy is moving through the three "d's," if I may express it as such: democratization, demonopolization, and decentralization. But these processes are developing unevenly. Demonopolization, for example, is only just beginning. It could be speeded up by changes in organizational structures—within the framework of the country's national economy, regions, and also individual sectors. This should be taken into consideration when drafting the 13th 5-year plan. I believe that, in addition to questions concerning the social sphere and defense, its priorities should definitely include the problems of saving resources. Everything should be geared to speeding up the introduction of new, waste-free, resource-saving technologies: scientific research, improvement of the economic mechanism and forms of labor and production organization, development of lease-cooperative relations, and financial levers. If this is not done, it will not just be difficult but impossible to enhance production efficiency and more rapidly resolve social problems.

Youth problems are also a priority—whatever form they take and in whatever specific instance advice may be given. One thing is clear, however: When drafting the 13th 5-year plan, it would be advisable to give a separate section to youth problems and the questions of forming a harmonious personality, beginning from childhood. Today's investment in youth problems is an investment in tomorrow's intellectual, moral, and cadre potential of our socialist fatherland.

However, neither well-considered measures nor fine plans will produce the necessary result if we do not improve matters directly at grassroots level. Relations within society are now changing very rapidly—so rapidly that public opinion cannot keep up and is sometimes left behind in the old, conservative attitudes. Because of the inertia of past years, public opinion is not averse to heaping the whole blame for our shortcomings even onto those who were responsible for initiating restructuring and who, together with the party and the people, have tackled the difficult job of purification and renewal. Of course, no one is absolving the center of blame. But have we at local level made full use of the rights and opportunities offered us by restructuring and begun to work so well that we can forget about self-criticism? It must be admitted that parasitical attitudes and group ambitions are being eradicated more slowly than the mood of criticism is growing. This is a source of serious concern and puts us on our guard. The principle of "seeing a mote in your brother's eye but not the beam in your own" is futile, as stated by popular wisdom.

Here in our republic we link improvement in the situation with a revival of full soviet power, transition to the principle of territorial self-financing, and an increase in discipline generally and labor discipline in particular. Of course, with the introduction of territorial self-financing, regional consciousness and decentralist attitudes will increase. For this reason, when giving legal foundation to the formula "a strong center, strong republics" we should, in my view, clearly define all areas of economic and economic management activity where the word of the republic will be final and not liable to appeal, as they say. Naturally, as long as this is not to the detriment of the country's national interests.

Relations between republics also need legal foundation. But, while strengthening republics' independence and sovereignty, we must also do our utmost to strengthen the supreme sovereignty of the union. As soon as any republic begins to pull more of the blanket over itself, the Leninist foundations of the federation of Soviet peoples inevitably start to disintegrate. Many USSR people's deputies from Belorussia have been given mandates from voters to protect our common home and do everything possible to ensure that it becomes the kind of home Vladimir Ilich Lenin imagined in his dreams. Yes, restructuring is a struggle, but a struggle of the new with the old, progress with stagnation, the progressive with the conservative. And those people who wish to turn it into confrontation between individual republics and the center and between one people and another are maliciously sidetracking us from the main issues. We must not forget about this, nor do we have the right to.

As a representative of a republic whose memories of the last war and the Chernobyl tragedy will never die, I would like to express support for broad international cooperation in the sphere of building a safe world and protecting the environment. It is gratifying that the new quality of the Soviet state's foreign policy, its dynamism, and bold rejection of ossified dogma in favor of a healthy perception of arising realities are finding a positive response throughout the world. And it is our duty, esteemed comrades, the duty of every deputy and every voter to every day do everything necessary to ensure that the decisions of our congress serve the glory of our socialist fatherland and are to the good and happiness of every Soviet citizen. Thank you. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: Vitaliy Andreyevich Masol has the floor. Let Deputy Likhachev, academician from Leningrad city, get ready.

V.A. Masol, chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, Kiev City (Donetskiy-Leninskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Ukrainian SSR): Esteemed Comrade People's Deputies! All of us—the participants in the first USSR Congress of People's Deputies—evidently agree that the events in the country's life at this crucial period are of tremendous abiding significance for our multiethnic homeland and for the future of the present and future generations.

Glancing back over the path that we have covered since April 1985, it is particularly obvious that the rapidly developing processes in the country's economic, political, and spiritual life have abruptly changed its social and moral climate. For the party and the people the last 4 years have been a time of active questing, the introduction of new forms and methods of political leadership of society, the development of popular initiative and glasnost, the renewal and restructuring of all aspects of the socialist economy. A great deal has been done in this area. But greater and more crucial tasks in the practical implementation of the restructuring course lie ahead of us in the immediate future. Their successful resolution will in many respects depend on the USSR people's deputies, our active stance—yours and ours—and the effective activity of the supreme organ of state power.

I think that key questions of economic reform will also hold a predominant position in the work of the new Supreme Soviet and the USSR Government in the coming period. In this connection it is particularly important to try to grasp and establish what we have achieved in the last 3-4 years and assess correctly the results of what has been done.

So, what have we succeeded in achieving? If we assess the sociopolitical situation that has taken shape at the present time in our republic, I must say outright that the ideas of restructuring have taken hold of the minds and hearts of most of the population. They are winning ever-increasing support every day. The intensification and deepening of restructuring processes, the unprecedented increase in people's social activeness, and the development of democratization and glasnost are the most significant results of the last few years.

In the sphere of socioeconomic development we have succeeded not only in overcoming the tendency for production and labor productivity growth rates to fall but also in ensuring an increase in the Ukraine's resource potential and making it function more fully for the solution of social tasks.

Nonetheless the positive results that have been achieved are still making a poor impact on meeting our people's needs and requirements and are not relieving the acuteness of many problems. That is why we still do not regard the incipient slight progress as a success but rather as the first signs of a gradual improvement in the prevailing situation, the start of our efforts to overcome the crisis recession and inertia of stagnation in the development of the social sphere.

We realize that the situation here will not be simple over the next few years and considerable efforts will be needed to radically improve the state of affairs.

We reckon that the new government should firmly and with greater consistency implement the line of the 19th All-Union Party Conference regarding the social reorientation of the economy. This should be the pivotal question of structural and investment policy, the cornerstone for shaping the targeted plan guidelines for the 13th 5-Year Plan period and the draft concept for the development of the country for the period through 2005. We fully support the terms of the report delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on this.

While studying questions of the republic's future comprehensive economic and social development and considering the siting of its productive forces, we need to consider regional factors more fully today. And, as a rule they also in many respects determine the dynamics of the indicators being forecast.

What are these factors? Above all it is a question of the fact that technology-generated pressures have increased sharply in the Ukrainian SSR, which occupies less than 3 percent of USSR territory but produces almost one-fifth of its gross social product. This has been caused by the fact that over a long period chemical and petrochemical industries and ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy enterprises developed rapidly within the republic and thermal and nuclear electric power stations were constructed at intensified rates.

We sense this particularly today. The high concentration of water-intensive production units has brought about a drastic deterioration of the situation with regard to the provision of water for the economy and the population. It is also extremely disquieting that the environmental situation in a number of areas of the republic is becoming complex and that the construction front is becoming overextended. Suffice it to say that since the beginning of this 5-year plan more than 1,000 new major construction sites at an overall estimated cost of almost R21 billion have been counted in our republic. Hundreds of transient construction units totaling R46 billion must be added to these. Under these conditions our construction workers are simply incapable of mastering the proposed volumes. Hence the long periods for the construction of facilities and the large volumes of incomplete construction work.

The republic has adopted the firm line of eliminating these distortions in the proportion of "A" and "B" group sectors and overcoming the lag in the development of the consumer-oriented sector of the economy. In 4 years the production of nonfood goods will increase by almost one-third; moreover the growth rates will outstrip by a factor of 1.5 the increase in industrial production as a whole. We have planned to reorient approximately 70 defense sector enterprises to the production of consumer goods by the end of this 5-year plan.

We think that along with us the newly-elected USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers' appropriate standing commissions must tackle in earnest the examination of the problems of every region's rational utilization of natural, raw material, and climatic conditions on the basis of specialization and the division of labor.

The Ukraine is, for instance, a unique agricultural region in the country for the cultivation of sugar beet and oilseed crops, which do not grow in more northerly regions. Today we produce 50-60 percent of the country's overall production of sunflower oil and sugar. At the same time soil and climatic conditions are by no means being fully utilized owing to technology-generated pressures.

In this connection we reckon that only production units which are not energy-intensive, water-intensive, and land-intensive should be sited in our republic in the immediate future. This will give us an opportunity to considerably expand the cultivation of agricultural crops and increase capacities for processing them.

Of course, we realize that all these questions are closely and indissolubly linked with the introduction of the idea of regional economic accountability [khozraschet] into the practice of interrepublican relations soon. We also realize that this can only have tangible and weighty results after a review of wholesale and purchase prices given full efficiency of economic accountability within every livestock unit, enterprise, and association.

This problem is very topical now and is being discussed extensively. That is why I would like to share some ideas with you on this score. It is our firm conviction that territories can only develop in a balanced and effective way within the framework of the country's single economic complex. No exclusive economic model and artificial extra-economic measures for protecting the intrarepublican market will produce the due effectiveness in economic management and will not provide the requisite return.

I can say with confidence that a temporary gain from the introduction of restrictions on interregional exchanges and cooperation in future will by no means cover the purely economic losses, not to mention the tremendous political damage and the increase in mutual mistrust and division between the fraternal peoples.

It is a correct understanding of the essence of regional economic accountability that opens up possibilities for consolidating the interests and aims of the union republic's peoples. Tasks of boosting the effectiveness of production and people's living standards cannot be resolved in isolation from one another but only on the basis of mutually advantageous equivalent exchange and active participation in the implementation of all-union programs.

I believe that, during the impending discussion of these questions at the USSR Supreme Soviet, we should make full use of the rich experience that the world economy has accumulated. It is no coincidence that all the EEC countries do not shut themselves away within their national borders. On the contrary, further integration is occurring within its framework and the community is proceeding with increasing confidence to introduce a single currency and remove customs restrictions.

We think that our economic and legal science should provide more in-depth, reasoned recommendations and scientifically conclusive answers to these difficult and sometimes very complex questions of interethnic economic intercourse. (Applause). The main thing is to ensure that these answers are precise and timely.

Comrade deputies, I am concerned by the following question. We have said a great deal about increasing agricultural production, while at the same time we are reducing the allocation to agriculture of material, technical, and financial resources every year. I have a question: How are we then to resolve the food problem under these conditions? I would like our government to direct particular attention to this and not sell mineral fertilizers and fuel abroad but allocate them primarily to our agriculture. (Applause).

Esteemed comrades, the people are saying that one good deed is better than a million fine words. It is our real concrete actions to restructure and renew socialist society and the resolute changes for the better in all spheres of public life that will be the most weighty argument. Allow me to wish you every success in this.

D.S. Likhachev, academician, head of sector, Russian Literature Institute (Pushkin House) of the USSR Academy of Sciences, chairman of the board of the Soviet Culture Foundation, Leningrad (from the Soviet Culture Foundation): Dear Comrade President. Dear comrade deputies. I shall speak only of the state of culture in our country and, mainly, its humanitarian, its human side. I made a close study of the electoral platforms of the deputies. I was astounded that the overwhelming majority of them did not even mention the word "culture." At the congress itself the word "culture" was mentioned in passing only on the 3d day. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke on this subject at that time.

Yet, without culture in a society there is no morality. Without basic morality the social laws and the economic laws will not function; ukases will not be implemented, and no contemporary science can exist, for it is difficult, for example, to check experiments that cost millions, huge plans for "construction projects of the century," and so on.

The low cultural standard of our country adversely affects our social life, the work of the government, and relations among nationalities, for a low cultural standard is one of the reasons for national hostility. People with a high cultural standard are not hostile toward other national groups or other people's views and are not aggressive. (Applause). Ignorance of basic formal logic and the elements of law and lack of social tactfulness, which is developed through culture, adversely affect the work of our congress. I believe this needs no explanation.

Unfortunately, the "residual" principle is still functioning in the case of culture. This is confirmed even by the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union, where humanitarian culture has been assigned the lowest priority. Look at the directory of the Academy of Sciences. It has virtually no listings for Russian culture.

The extremely low level of culture in our country is confirmed, to begin with, by the condition of cultural and historical monuments. This is obvious to all, and thus I shall not discuss it. The second is the condition of libraries and archives. About the latter, incidentally, the penultimate issue of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA adequately wrote about it. There as well this situation prevails in the largest and the small, rural, libraries. Third, the condition of museums, the condition of education, secondary and primary above all, where the individual's culture is developed.

Let me start with the libraries. The library is the most important part of culture. There may be no universities, institutes, or scientific institutions, but if there are libraries, if such libraries do not burn down or are not flooded, if they have premises equipped with modern facilities, if they are headed not by people off the street but by professionals, culture will not perish in that country. (Applause). Nonetheless, our most important libraries in Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities are burning down like candles. This particularly applies to Leningrad. Water is poured on them, they lack modern fire extinguishing devices, they have no modern equipment, and they have extremely small premises. Let me cite a single example: As early as 1900 Leningrad University Library raised the question of a space shortage. To this day, however, no single addition has been built. None has been built in our country. Even in the main library, which is fully equipped with modern library facilities, even in the main V.I. Lenin National Library, about which I am particularly concerned, although I have been insulted there, small fires break out. Compare this to the Library of Congress of the United States.

What can we say about the rural libraries? Rayon libraries are frequently closed down (in Moscow, for example, this applies to the Nekrasov Library) because premises are needed for other purposes. The same occurs in Leningrad.

Library workers dealing directly with the public—and I emphasize that I am speaking not of administrators but of the officials who deal directly with the readers—that is, those who should be able to recommend a book, have no time themselves to read and be familiar with books and journals, for they lead a life of semi-poverty. Take a look at the 23 April (1950) issue of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. It says everything accurately. The average salary of a librarian was 110 rubles. The average wage (in 1948) was 220 rubles. The rural rayon librarians, who should be the main authorities in the countryside and who educate people and recommend books, earn 50 rubles. Yet, despite the myth of its alleged backwardness, 19th century Russia was the most advanced country in the world in terms of libraries. I claim this but I am unable to prove it today. Let me remind you that in 1918-1920, at the meetings of the Sovnarkom the question of libraries was considered on 31 occasions and, by the Sovnarkom commissions, more than 50 times.

Now as to the museums. The picture here is similar: antediluvian technical equipment. The salaries of workers who deal with the public and with the items—not administrators but restorers, custodians and guides, is inadmissibly low. Yet it is they precisely who are the true enthusiasts, as are the "low-level" library workers. Particularly unsatisfactory is the calamitous situation of restorers, unless they do hack work. In that kind of work they can earn a great deal, particularly as members of cooperatives.

We have an incalculable museum wealth despite all of our sales, which are partially continuing to this day. However, the condition of cultural monuments is poor and we are forced to invite restoration workers from Poland, Bulgaria and Finland, which is much more expensive. At the Russian Museum in Leningrad which, incidentally, is much bigger than the Tretyakov, there is a shortage of master restorers, for they cannot subsist on their miserable salaries. The situation of the restorers of the Kremlin is the same. Yesterday I visited the restoration workshop of the Kremlin during the lunch break, crawling up an iron step-ladder to an attic premise. It would be interesting to know whether any minister of culture has ever visited these workshops? I believe that they would find it difficult even to get there. A restorer first class of the Moscow Kremlin has a salary of 150 rubles. What does first category restorer mean? It is the equivalent of a doctor of sciences. The same requirements must be met by a first category restorer. The Russian Museum in Leningrad does not have any restorer trainees, for students do not go into restoration work: the salary is too low.

The same or even a worse situation prevails in our schools. Today we must simply protect children and educators. School teachers have no authority. They have no time to add to their own knowledge. I could but will not cite examples. Teaching is based on a variety of curricula which duplicate the command-administrative methods of the past, with regulatory instructions and low-quality methods. Teaching in secondary schools means above all educating. This is a creative work of the educator and creativity cannot exist without freedom. It demands freedom. For that reason the teacher must, in addition to the curriculum, have the possibility to tell the students about that which he himself loves and values. He must promote in them love for literature, art and so on.

Let me point out that the students themselves notice these serious shortcomings in our press. Teachers in Russia have always ruled the minds of the young. Today's teacher does not have enough funds to subsist or to dress more or less adequately.

You may ask, where to find the money to raise the living standard of the people whose professions are turned to man, to man precisely, and not to objects? I am a realist. At the risk of turning into enemies many of my comrades, I shall tell you. First: We must reduce, quite decisively at that, the exceptionally inflated and well-paid administrative apparatus of all cultural and ministerial institutions. (Applause). Let those who draft the methods themselves go into teaching according to their methods and implement their own instructions. Let them protect the monuments. Let them guide tourists—that is, let ministry workers work.

Museums should be given funds from Inturist income, which it earns from our poorly preserved cultural values. I was told yesterday that Inturist is ready to contribute 20 percent of its income for the restoration of monuments. This is a splendid Inturist initiative. It must be thoroughly supported and praised and must not remain in words only. (Applause). It is necessary to appropriate for culture more funds as a result of the reduction of military expenditures, as mentioned by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, by reducing aid given to other countries, aid coming out of our people's funds, and about which we know little. (Applause).

Culture cannot operate on a cost accounting basis. Returns from culture to the people and the country are immeasurably greater than from possible direct income earned by libraries, archives and museums or by any other economic and technical area. I assert this. However, such returns do not come immediately. The low status of culture and morality, and the growth of crime make all of our efforts in any area sterile and useless. We shall not be able to reform the economy, science or public life and we will be obstructing perestroyka if our culture remains on its present level.

The work of the Ministry of Culture must be substantially improved. People are constantly turning to us, to the Soviet Culture Foundation, with problems which the ministries of culture are not solving. The ministries of culture must be concerned with the peripheral areas as well. We send a great deal of exhibits abroad. However, we have not sent exhibits to our peripheral cities. Our museums have tremendous reserves. However, the organization of exhibits using such reserves for the benefit of peripheral cities, in order to enhance the cultural standards and interests of the people, is very infrequent and very poorly implemented.

Particular attention should be paid to the peripheral museums and to peripheral and rural libraries. Permanent peripheral exhibits based on our reserve stock must be organized.

We must formulate a long-term program for the development of culture in our country. To the best of my knowledge, no such program exists. It is only in such a case that there will be no more national disputes which confirm the low cultural standard. Instead, there will be a normal economic life and the crime rate will decline. In particular, public figures will become more honest.

Allow me to read to you an excerpt from a letter addressed to our Komsomol, which should be particularly concerned with enhancing the cultural standard. This letter expresses the view of millions of our mothers and educators. I quote: "Since the Komsomol is trying by all possible means to prove its expediency and the need for its very existence precisely as a social organization, its apparat and the people's deputies elected by the Komsomol should assume full responsibility for the state of affairs in the country related to the increased number of neglected children. In my view, these comrades should not rest until even a single minor citizen is subject to abuse and coercion on the part of adults corrupted by our society and who are now corrupting other adolescents. It is time for many citizens, comrades, to drop their mercantile concerns and comfortable positions and literally go into entrance halls and basements and, perhaps, go even deeper, in order actively to participate in their life and with a view to putting an end to processes of corrupting minors, which are taking place everywhere."

The fate of the fatherland is in your hands, and the fatherland is in danger. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Nishanov: Deputy Yanenko has the floor. Comrade Nazarbayev is to get ready.

A.P. Yanenko, rector of the Novosibirsk Engineering and Construction Institute, Novosibirsk (Oktyabrskiy Territorial District, RSFSR): Esteemed comrade deputies! We have just heard the report of the Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is your task and mine to

discuss this report and express our comments and suggestions. Evidently all this taken together will then serve as the basis for our subsequent work. I am confident that in the process of the presentations there will be many a great many questions of those who are heard today and in the days to come. But these questions, from my point of view, will vary in terms of their significance. Some of them will be examined by commissions, in committees and at Supreme Soviet sessions; and part will require examination right here, at the Congress of People's Deputies. One such question, from point of view is the question of the functions of the Soviets of People's Deputies. Yes, it is namely we who must cause the Soviets to become a genuine popular organ of power. The first major step in this direction, from my point of view, will be adopting a resolution, in accordance with which the people's deputies would distribute the state budget. The people's deputies of the country—that is, we—would distribute the state budget; deputies of the republic, the republic budget; and so on. Then in accordance with the existing budget, they would draw up and approve the plan for the country's socio-economic development; that is, taking into consideration those sums which the country or the republic have.

Amazing things would happen under such a scheme. Exactly what? It would not be the deputy who goes to the minister with his hand held out, and I apologize for my choice of words—but the minister, who would appeal to the deputies, requesting their approval of the budget or estimated costs for his ministry, specifically, for certain purposes. And a year later, he would be reporting back, on how these moneys were spent. (Applause).

In this connection I propose that the following sentence be added to Point Five, Article 108, of our country's Constitution: "The Congress of People's Deputies shall approve long-range state plans, and shall also approve and distribute the state budget." That is my proposal. (Applause).

The next question which, from my point of view, we must discuss at this congress—is the question of the work of the USSR Council of Ministers. I know full well that Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has yet to give his speech; but today we are discussing the report of our country's Supreme Soviet chairman. I shall cite Article 113; in Point Five, the following is written: "...Regularly receive reports from organs formed by or assembled by it." That is, our country's Supreme Soviet must control the work of the USSR Council of Ministers. Unfortunately, thus far we have not observed this.

As is well known, the CPSU works out the general strategic policy for our country's development. And it is the task of the Council of Ministers to put this policy into effect. Perhaps I am mistaken, and this is purely my own personal point of view, but the present make-up of the USSR Council of Ministers is not coping with this task. (Applause). The state of affairs in our economy testifies to this; the ever-increasing deficit in the state budget testifies to this; and the empty shelves in our stores testifies to this. And the numerous resolutions and instructions prepared and issued by the Council of Ministers, which contain many poorly-thought-out decisions, testifies to this.

But what should we do, that our Council of Ministers would operate with precision and effectiveness? I think that, first of all, the Council of Ministers should think about its prestige. Why? Because any state document must be flawless; so that, pardon the expression, "a mosquito couldn't sharpen his nose on it." But, there are often many complaints after a government document is published, and many unclear features and inaccuracies.

Why does this happen? I repeat once again; this takes place because who do not have a council; there is no Council of Ministers. And transcripts of the sessions of the Council of Ministers have convinced me of the truth of these words.

What do we observe? We observe the following: when the adoption of this or that resolution or decision takes place, our ministers amiably raise their hands; not one of them opposes it; not one of them objects. And there is our misfortune; there is our problem. (Applause).

This takes place because many of the ministers, before becoming a minister, passed through the great school of apparat work, where the habit became ingrained of working with one eye on the higher authority. And this habit leads to a situation in which the higher authority, with the passage of time, becomes convinced of his own genius. And whatever the higher authority proposes, it always meets with general approval. This is the first factor.

The second factor is that the lower authority begins to think less, because someone else is doing his thinking for him. We must do everything we can, that this does not happen.

How can we do this? I think that in order for a sensible collective decision to be made, we must present our ministers, our Supreme Soviet and Congress of People's Deputies with alternative solutions. I think it would be sensible for us to introduce a so-called department of experts at the USSR Council of Ministers and Supreme Soviet. Some one would prepare a resolution (either the Council of Ministers or the Supreme Soviet); then, at the next stage, when the draft of this resolution is already prepared, it should be given to the department of experts. And the department would invite for expert analysis, scientists or other persons, who had not taken part in the preparation of this resolution or decision. And then different opinions would be worked out and presented to the Council of Ministers, the Supreme Soviet or the congress, for their verdict. And it would be our task to choose the best solution from among a large number of opinions. If this were the case, the most clear-cut and the best-thought-out decision would always

be taken. But at the same time, as was already stated at the congress, I believe that the voting should be replaced with mandates. And this, we should write down. The voting must be secret. I believe that it would not be hard at all to equip every chair in the hall with a button, connected to an electronic computer. Precise, clear, and good.

Now, since I have touched on the Council of Ministers, I would like to say a few words about those who work there. I consider it necessary and wise if five or six ministers would speak here, at our congress—those, whose enterprises have permitted a radical reduction in the production of consumer goods (applause), so that we could then express our own opinion: but could the given minister lead this ministry in the future? And in the future we should make every effort to ensure that several ministers would always speak at the congress.

As I have touched on the question of having the ministers speak, I personally would very much like to hear the speeches of two chairmen—the chairman of Gosplan and the chairman of Goskomstat. The Gosplan chairman could describe to us just how they have planned and are planning, so that sewing machines and refrigerators disappear from the stores; and how a great many other things have disappeared, which even five or seven years ago were on the shelves. And naturally, the question arises: if Gosplan is unable to plan—then pardon me, but why should we keep it? That's the first thing.

Second: The chairman of Goskomstat, from my point of view, must share his secret: How are such cunning reference books compiled? Glancing tin the latest handbook which was given to the deputies, we see that our state of affairs is brilliant. In 1988, as compared with 1985, there was an increase in consumer, goods; and an increase in the most important foodstuffs. But pardon me, we cannot see them on the shelves of our stores. Perhaps there was an increase at the snack bars or cafeterias of Goskomstat, but not at our place. (Applause).

I believe that the People's Deputies of the USSR must know the true state of affairs in the country. And passing out handbooks with false data borders on the criminal. Therefore we must deal with this question very carefully.

At this time I would like to offer yet another suggestion. I believe that we should adopt a resolution, in accordance with which we would make public the authors of this or that suggestion, in order that there be no anonymous authors. What am I leading up to? Here's what: A great many comrades propose this or that solution, knowing that even if it results in colossal losses, they will never have to answer for it. So I am offering the suggestion that the press should publish who it was that offered a given proposal. Next time he would be extremely careful and would act thoughtfully.

Now I would like to touch on several questions, not connected with one another; but I believe they require our attention.

The first question—about people who live in the countryside. Mikhail Sergeyevich's report spoke of the fact that greater attention must be devoted to agriculture. I am in complete agreement with this. In my district there were three rural rayons. But you know, before talking about economic reform in the countryside, I believe we must restore obligations to our rural area. In what sense must we restore them? (Applause). We must create normal conditions there, such as those which urban residents have. Only then do we have the right to make demands on them. You have already heard that enterprises in our country have increased production of agricultural machinery; but they have also increased the purchase price two and three-fold. But the peasant, as before, sells his product at the same price that existed five or ten years ago. This is not right. This must be re-examined. (Applause).

While meeting with my constituents I became convinced that social injustice exists with respect to the kolkhoznik. What do I have in mind? It turns out that if I have worked on a kolkhoz for five or six years and I go to a factory, I am not given credit for continued work experience. I believe that our country is one, and that everyone should enjoy identical rights and laws. (Applause).

The next question. We often read in the newspapers of the fact that Siberian gas has come to the villages and cities of the European part of the country. We are very happy for our comrades, but are waiting impatiently for the time that Siberian gas comes to the villages of Siberia. I believe that this most certainly must be done, and I submit this proposal.

The next question. A trend is observed in the country to reject the administrative-command style of leadership. But you see the latest decision on the fact that taxes from transport must be used for building the roads of the Nechernozem is, I believe, a return to the command-administrative style. (Applause).

How could such a decision be made, not knowing the condition of the other roads in the country? I submit the suggestion, that the authors of this decision set out in October on an auto trip along the route Omsk-Novosibirsk-Krasnoyarsk-Irkutsk-Chita. And send a documentary film crew with them, so that they can show us films on the condition of our roads. Then they would be convinced of whether or not to spend all the funds on the Nerchernozem zone, or whether it would be better to allocate money to where it is also needed.

And the last: This question concerns the city of Moscow, and I believe that it must be touched. I ask the forgiveness of our Muscovites, but here is the question: From my point of view, everyone in our country should have

identical conditions. But how has it turned out? I will cite only an incident of last year. Last year, the Central Committee, headed by Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev, examined the question of supplying the city of Moscow with vegetables. The next day I went into one of our stores to see for myself; apparently we have an abundance? But it turned out not to be so. And what happened after that. It turned out that after that, those trains which were to have gone to Siberia and somewhere else also, had gone to Moscow. And so, when making such decisions, one must think about everyone.

A second question. While I was on a business trip to Moscow last January, I learned with amazement that it turns out that a citizen of Moscow, having paid a visit to a physician, can get a medical certificate for ten days. But a citizen of Novosibirsk does not have that opportunity. I could cite a lot more such examples, but I shall not dwell on this. I believe that in our state, everyone should be equal. Thank you. (Applause).

Nishanov: Deputy Nazarbayev has the floor. Next to speak will be Deputy Kampbergenov.

N.A. Nazarbayev, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers, Alma-Ata (Alma-Ata-Ili Territorial Electoral District): Esteemed comrade deputies! During the course of our congress, numerous reasons have been cited for the lack of progress in the restructuring process, by the previous comrade as well. I would like to continue this idea.

I would support the statements of Comrades Popov, Adamovich and others in the part in which they sharply criticize the empty shelves, the increase in prices, the deficit and other shortcomings. We all understand, sense, and see these things, and this criticism is just. Pluralism of opinions was supported by Lenin himself: "We do not pretend that Marx or Marxists know the path to socialism in all its specificity. That is nonsense. We know the direction of this path; we know what kind of class forces lead to it; but in concrete and practical terms, this is shown only by the experience of the millions, when they get down to business."

Does it not seem to you, esteemed deputies, that we are indeed the representatives of the millions who have gotten down to business; who are expecting from us the decisions which will transform our society for the better within the framework of socialist choice. In my view the root of our troubles lies in solving the main problem—in healing the sickness of the basis, the economy. For this we need an accurate diagnosis. Having been employed by virtue of my duties with questions of practical economy, I can say that we do not have a reliable picture of the situation in the country's economy. I shall single out the conclusions from a PRAVDA report in May on the results of the Council of Ministers session. In my view, it successfully depicted the worsening crisis in the economy. Judge for yourselves: According to data from Goskomstat USSR, production output in the country has not increased, and the shelves are empty. The decisions taken on economic reform have sharply increased the flow of unearned money, and the cheap assortment is being washed away. Plans are being fulfilled, and the state of the economy is getting worse. The necessary growth of food production in the country is not taking place, and agricultural income is growing. Why? Many such "whys" have accumulated. We must at last define the entire depth of the crisis in the economy and work out a clear-cut path for overcoming it.

In this connection the deputies are correct in appealing to the scientists, whom I respect, of whom there are quite a few among the deputies. We know that during the period of stagnation, the opinions of the scientists were not considered, nor were ours. The apparat controlled everyone, and did its own thing. But from the very beginning of restructuring a commission was established in the government for improving the economic mechanism. The backbone of this commission, its scientific section, represents the flower of our economic science, the generators of the scientific ideas of reform. And the government, having taken counsel with them, is making decisions. But what do we have in fact? Today we have had the first, second and third models of cost accounting [khozraschet]; no doubt there will also be a fourth. But you see, cost accounting does not in fact exist! (Applause).

There once was an old regulator—average wages; we have done away with it, and rightly so. But we have not thought of a new one. Thereby we have doubled the issuance of currency, and have impaired the already-unbalanced financial situation in the country. The 12th 5-Year Plan was drawn up in the very worst traditions of the stagnation. In order to at least outwardly correct it, it was stated in all the documents that the indicator for commodity production is taken as an estimate for analytical purposes. But who believes this? Growth rates are lagging; wages, just as before, have been tied to volume in rubles; and gross output is cranked up by means of repeating the counts and the costs, and getting one's wages without producing goods, and without completing projects: We have learned to do this long ago and continue to do so. And this indicator, which was condemned at the 27th party conference and the June 1986 Central Committee Plenum, continues to live. Gross output in rubles, and not in goods, has become even more powerful in the 12th 5-Year Plan, and has achieved its apogee. Satisfying the needs of the people and not the indicators of the agencies also remains a slogan. And now we are forced to return to the most archaic indicator—the correlation between labor productivity and average wages, which has been introduced by four respected agencies. I hope I do not offend them, but at the enterprises this document bears the title, "Letters from the Gang of Four." (Applause).

Comrades! The given indicator cannot work, because labor productivity has a significant influence on the price level; that is, the higher the price the higher the

labor productivity. After all, according to the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist political economy, increasing labor productivity reduces prices; but with us for now the opposite is true—growth of prices increases labor productivity and wages. The entire economy has gone over to self-financing, and wholesale prices were not re-examined. Right now the profitability of milk and meat is low, products which we now badly need, and we want to hang the old obligations of the village on the necks of the tenants. Wholesale trade is not developed, and there are no resources. We know from the mass information media of the fact that in the entire world it is accepted that, if someone introduces a proposal and manages to have it accepted—and that if it turns out in fact to be bankrupt, a bust—then the authors are retired. And so we too, deputies, ought to know who in fact drew up such a five-year plan, and whose ideas are being carried out in the course of our restructuring?

We have rejected anonymity. Therefore, let us put a stop to anonymity for the authors of the various models of khosraschet, and reform in the villages. We must know our heroes, know who's who. (Applause). We must work out, together with the scientists, various alternative variants of administration in the branches and the republics; of course, in accordance with uniform principles and taking into consideration the specific features of each region. And this will form the basis of republic scientific khozraschet. At the same time one must take into consideration that at today's prices, this will nevertheless build the economy on a foundation of sand. At first all the republics agreed on this khozraschet, and then certain of them rejected it. In think that one should carefully consider all suggestions without exception, to include the Moscow group of deputies.

Departmental diktat has led to the situation that while it is one of the richest in terms of raw material resources, which enjoy great demand on the world market, our republic finds itself in a tough situation in its social development, and is on the brink of an ecological crisis. Acting like a bull in a china shop, the ministry has destroyed the Aral Sea. Ekibastuz is becoming covered with ash. Oil does not serve those who are extracting it. In various regions herdsmen have been put off the land, and there is no talk of compensation.

I would especially like to speak about the Semipalatinsk nuclear test range, which has been in operation since 1949, and which began its bursts at first in the atmosphere. Since that time the surrounding population has increased fourfold. But the military are ready to try to convince us that the tests are almost beneficial to the people's health. We understand that testing today is a state necessity. But we must conduct a genuine in-depth analysis of the influence of atomic explosions on the surrounding environment, and tell the people about it. Not to mention certain expenditures to improve the lives of those who live there.

Four years of restructuring have gone by, and the union-level ministries do not yet permit the enterprises to make use of even above-plan production; or even industrial wastes and secondary resources, oil and coal. All the rest, which Kazakhstan has been permitted to keep, comprises merely 7.0 percent of the volume of industry, while from the 93, only 1.0 percent is deducted from its profits for the republic. How long will the republic have to walk around in Moscow offices with its hand stretched out? (Applause).

Comrade deputies! The creative genius of man has created Baikonur, and the splendid city of Leninsk. But you could hardly know that the gateway to the nation's space port, Tyura Tam, remains the squalid refuge of the local population, who are not allowed, as Chingiz Aitmatov wrote in "Burannyy Polustanok," even to the burial places of their ancestors. The Maykain deposits gave the country a billion rubles in gold, but the life of the population of this village remains primitive. And I could cite many such examples. Our government, with the help of scientists, must propose measures for balancing the economy. Whatever they like; but, we must begin to live within our means. There is a decree, that unbalanced plans shall not be accepted in the country. But this decree must be carried out. And we must reduce production losses in the country which take place because of the lack of processing equipment.

The defense industry branches, which have been instructed to create the latest equipment for [food] processing and preserving, are making a mess of the resolution. Once again, no one is to blame. I must say, that in Kazakhstan alone, we lose 20-30 percent of our meat, milk and vegetables every year, just like in the rest of the country. Look where our food resources are! Because of the ministries, comrades. Neither you nor I know today what would take the place of the ministries. I would like to say, that while I know many ministers personally, they are not the ones who were there in 1984. Many of them have been replaced. These are yesterday's top managers at major enterprises, and specialists. I think we should not rush from one extreme to another. But even these new ministers have been unable to break up the monopolism, and change the role of the departments. We must create major firms, associations, and concerns which would themselves select their own organs in Moscow for long-range coordination. But we shall never overcome our illness, by not carrying out, and not answering for failure to carry out, good decisions.

The realization of the slogan, "All Power to the Soviets," has been dragged out. In actual fact, today the Soviets do not yet have the capability to independently resolve questions on the comprehensive development of their territory: they have neither the legal, nor the material-technical, nor the financial, nor the cadre base with which to do this. The adoption of the Law on Local Self-Administration must be accelerated. What sort of power can one speak of today, although we have been talking for four years already! In fact it does not exist!

We must also give the local Soviets from the rayon to the republic level the legal authority to suspend the decision of any agency of any rank in instances in which they would lead to ecological complications, or threaten the safety and health of the populace in a given region. (Applause).

We must genuinely increase the responsibility of administrators in the oblasts, republics and ministries for improving the lives of the populace in the localities. Unfortunately, we have not had much to say about just what in the localities, and just what in the rayon, the oblast, the republic, the kolkhoz, the sovkhoz, and the enterprise is slowing down the cause of restructuring today. Restructuring has already given us many opportunities; but we must skillfully take advantage of them. People must at last understand that it is not the government that feeds them, but the other way around: they are feeding everyone. I support the thesis in Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev's speech on the fact that specific deeds are required, right now. For this discipline is required, in production and in society. I think that destabilization is beneficial only to the anti-restructuring forces. We must strengthen legality, elevate the role of administrative organs, and carry out the Soviet laws.

In the stormy processes of these days, we must not forget about the fact that the past 70 years did not consist of failures alone, and that the existing economic potential did not descend from heaven, but is the result of the labor of the older generations and the efforts of all the nations. We do not need autarchy; we need to strengthen our economic conveyer; and the entire world is now occupied with integration.

The deputies spoke figuratively of the danger of the break-up of a ship on the ocean. I would use that image also for the friendship of nations in our country. The Supreme Soviet must find a mechanism for an integral state on a new Leninist basis. The diktat issued from the agencies located in Moscow, in the consciousness of certain people, is associated with Russia, with the Russian people. I do not agree with this. Russia herself has suffered from this a good deal. Are they really not speaking about the Nechernozem and its ecological problems, which are even more severe than in other republics? But you see no one can say that Russia had at one time pulled all the blankets over itself alone. I believe that Russia's prestige must also be raised. (Applause).

At the same time, comrades, only a strong republic can be the basis of a strong center. We must in fact expand the rights of all republics as equal, sovereign members of a federated union in its Leninist conception. An effective mechanism must be developed for realizing the authority of the republics; a monopoly at the nucleus as the exclusive property of the Union must be within sensible limits, and their reworking must be advantageous for the republics as well. It is necessary to guarantee a worthy government of national republics, with leadership of all federal organs, including the legal, defense and foreign-policy organs. (Applause).

With all due respect, Mikhail Sergeyevich, I cannot help but speak of yet another sore spot for Kazakhs. I quote from my own notes, your speech at the Politburo in May 1987: "I would like to state principally, that Kazakhstan was at a high level in December 1986. There was no political crisis in Kazakhstan. I would not like to place internationalism in Kazakhstan under suspicion."

These words were my principal response to the numerous questions of my constituents, and won the hearty approval of everyone. The 34 academicians, the writers and cinematographers, and the very flower of the Soviet intelligentsia, who in the war years were forced to work in Kazakhstan, could also testify to the internationalism of the Kazakh people. The pioneers on the virgin lands and today's people's deputies, who represent all of multinational Kazakhstan, could also testify to this. Right now everything is being done in the republic to more fully consider the interests of all the nations which dwell in Kazakhstan, for the purpose of strengthening their traditional friendship.

Each of the deputies speaking at the congress has his own attitude to that which is taking place in country. One would think that this does not divide us, but rather unites us all. I am in favor of the formula described in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report. There can be a variety of opinions, but we have one policy, and that is—restructuring. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Nishanov: Comrade deputies! I think that if you have no objections, Deputy Kampbergenov, the writer and our comrade, will speak after the intermission. But now we must take counsel together on a number of questions. Several deputies are asking us to tell them when they will be offered the floor for a speech at the debates. In this connection I should evidently inform you, my dear comrades, that 440 people have signed up for speeches at the debates for this hour. The secretariat of the congress is preparing a corresponding suggestion for the presidium, but to say right now, who may speak and when; well, you can understand that is rather difficult right now. But we can promise you: we shall hold the discussion in a democratic manner, and in detail. Deputy Andreeva has made a small comment and suggestion. She writes, "We are always hearing from the top people in the republic; therefore, their reports are not very useful for the congress. What are needed are new proposals and new points of view." (Applause).

Comrades, comrades! Just a moment! We took counsel together with you, and we agreed, considering the multinational nature and federated make-up of the Soviet Union, that each republic be given an opportunity. But look, during the speeches of a number of republic leaders

you became convinced that there were no self-serving speeches, but there was very interesting criticism, creative criticism. (Applause). Therefore, we shall take our turns. Thank you for your support. (Applause).

Comrades! As you will recall, we have authorized the members of the presidium of the congress to hold consultations with a group of deputies elected from Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast in connection with the fact that the results of the elections to the Soviet of Nationalities from this oblast have not been confirmed. Such consultations were held. At this time I would like to offer the floor to Deputy Pogosyan, on this question.

G.A. Pogosyan, pensioner (Stepanakert National-Territorial Electoral District, Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast): Esteemed deputies! On behalf of the group of deputies from NKAO, I would like to express my deep gratitude for the interested and objective examination of the incident which arose among the groups of deputies from the Azerbaijan republic and the oblast with respect to the gross violation of the rights of the latter to themselves resolve questions of representation in the Supreme Soviet. I would also like to express our gratitude to Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev, who found it possible to personally take part in the meeting of the parties on investigation of the conflict.

We are especially grateful to the representatives of the workers of the glorious city of Leningrad—Comrade Sobchak, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich; and Comrade Denisov, Anatoliy Alekseevich—who from the kindest of motives, decided to give up their seats in the Supreme Soviet in favor of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh. We consider representation in this organ of the deputies from the ever-revolutionary Leningrad much more important and useful than ours. We are morally satisfied already by the fact that after properly understanding and evaluating the situation, the deputies have practically protected our rights from another encroachment by the republic.

Having taken counsel, the group decided to propose for inclusion in the bulletin of the repeat election, the deputies whom we had previously nominated: Comrade Balayan and Comrade Pogosyan. However, considering the fact that Comrade Dzhafarov found himself in a difficult situation which was not his fault, we believed it necessary to include him on the list as well. Thus, we propose including the following candidates in the bulletin: Comrade Zoriy Gaykovich Balayan, Comrade Vagif Dzhafarovich Dzhafarov, and Pogosyan. I am confident that the deputies will be able to make the correct choice for the two seats allocated to us according to the quota. If for some reason the voting will be open, I would asked the presidium of the congress to refrain from taking part in the voting, in order not to obliquely influence its results. Thank you. (Applause).

Nishanov: I believe that the presidium of the congress is conducting itself in a highly democratic manner, which we have thus far no reason to doubt. All right, Comrade Dzhafarov, a deputy, is asking for the floor. Please, Comrade Dzhafarov:

V.D. Dzhafarov, first secretary of the Shushinskiy Rayon Party Committee, city of Shusha (Shushinskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast): Esteemed cOmrade chairman! Esteemed comrade deputies! Inasmuch as on Saturday the question of the representation of the NKAO in the Soviet of Nationalities caused, as they say here, a crisis situation, I believe it is necessary to make the following statement. I think that the decision taken to annul the results of the election in the NKAO is a consequence of the deputies' lack of information on the true state of affairs. I also believe that my rights were grossly violated, inasmuch as the results of secret balloting were annulled by an open vote and thereby repudiated the expression of the will of almost 2,000 delegates who had cast their ballots for me.

But that is not the main thing. I would like to tell you how it came about that my candidature was included in the election bulletin. I was born, live and work in Shushinskiy Rayon of Nagorno-Karabakh, where over 90 percent of the populace is Azerbaijani. Azerbaijanis live in practically all the 220 populated places in the oblast, and in 53 of them they comprise an overwhelming majority; thus, more than one-fourth of the voters who took part in the elections in the NKAO are Azerbaijanis. And as a representative of this portion of the population of the oblast, I am a member of the Special Administration Committee of Nagornyy Karabakh.

Prior to the beginning of the work of the congress, a conference of deputies from NKAO was held in Stepanakert. Taking part in it were three deputies out of the five. Balayan was in America, and Grigoryan had gone to Yerevan to take part in meetings taking place there. In addition, also taking part in the conference was Dadamyan, elected on a quota not from NKAO but from the Azerbaijan SSR. We reached an agreement to send to the Soviet of Nationalities two people, and my candidature. In this connection the assertion of the deputies from Armenia of somekind of usurpation is nothing other than disinformation.

And now about the other candidatures spoken of here: Balayan and Pogosyan. Zoriy Balayan is a permanent resident of Armenia; Pogosyan at the present time does not live in NKAO either, having moved to Moscow. Therefore, it is being proposed to make persons who do not live or work in NKAO its representatives in the Soviet of Nationalities.

And finally, I have the legal and moral right to be nominated to the Soviet of Nationalities from the NKAO of Azerbaijan SSR. I want you to understand me correctly. I am motivated by the firm conviction, that the

presence in the Soviet of Nationalities of representatives from Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the two nations which live in the oblast answers our principal task—to achieve mutual understanding and stabilization, and to meet one another halfway. Therefore I consider it unacceptable to hold another election. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Nishanov: My dear comrades, of course we all understand the exceptionally delicate nature of this question. We, the participants in the congress and its presidium believe that we are all united in the opinion to help the NKAO and the Azerbaijan and Armenian republics to peacefully solve this problem. Therefore, of course, additional people are signing up to speak, and so on. Perhaps we can limit the speeches of these two comrades, and if you agree, include all three comrades on the bulletin for secret balloting? This evening we shall vote, and whatever the results will be, we shall agree to them. Will that be correct?

From the hall: Correct.

Nishanov: Are there any more proposals?

From the audience: No.

Nishanov: Please prepare the mandates.

From the audience: (Noise in hall; inaudible remark).

Nishanov: Does everyone agree with this proposal?

From the audience: (Inaudible).

Nishanov: Then, who is in favor of including all three comrades?... Who is opposed? One moment... Comrades, a moment. It has become necessary to continue the exchange of opinions. Please, Deputy Barusheva wants to speak.

L.V. Barusheva, seamstress at the Baku Volodarskiy Sewing Factory (Bakinskiy-Nasiminskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Azerbaijan SSR): Comrade deputies! I call your attention to the exceptional importance of the decision which you are now taking. I do not want to dramatize the situation in the least, but I ask you to believe me, that peace in an explosive region depends upon this step. It is unfortunate, but this is the objective reality. Only one thoughtless statement by one of the deputies on the day the congress opened heated up the situation in the city of Baku.

I live a long way from Nagorno-Karabakh, and have not personally experienced, nor have my close relatives experienced the absurdity and the cruelty of national enmity; yet many people lightly hand off their prescriptions for resolving the problem. We do not have the right to deprive the Azerbaijani populace of the oblast to have its own representative in the USSR Supreme Soviet. After all, it comprises more than one-fourth of the population of Nagorno-Karabakh. Nor must we forget the fact that Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast is a constituent part of Azerbaijan SSR. What would be wrong with seating two residents of Karabakh—an Armenian and an Azerbaijani here together? Could one really find a deputy who would not like to put an end to an unnatural situation, which has already kept at a fever pitch for two years not only two republics, but the entire country. And so, why complicate the situation further? Deputy Dzhafarov was born, grew up, and works in Nagorno-Karabakh. He is well-known and respected there; and he is a member of the Special Administration Committee. I appeal to all of you, Comrade Deputies, to take a well-reasoned decision, and to vote for equal representation, and thereby vote for justice and peace for tens of thousands of people. And it is namely therefore that I consider it inexpedient to conduct a second election. I request that you support my proposal. (Applause).

Nishanov: Who would also like to take part in the discussion of this question? Please, come forward.

S.A. Gabrusev, chief of synthetic fiber production at the Khimvolokno V.I. Lenin Production Association in Mogilev (Mogilev City National-Territorial Electoral District, Belorussian SSR): Esteemed deputies! Your question is being discussed at the highest levels. Since in the given situation we are the electors, we do not have the right to take upon ourselves the responsibility for resolving it. Therefore, I propose holding a referendum in NKAO on this problem, after preparing variants which have been heard from one side and the other. Let us hold a referendum in Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast. (Applause).

Nishanov: One moment please, Sergey Aleksandrovich. The lady is asking for the floor, and then you can speak. Please, come forward.

M.N. Rakhmanova, chief of the polyclinic pedatrics department at the Orenburg Medical Institute (from the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund): Esteemed deputies! I live a long way from Nagornyy Karabakh, in Orenburg Oblast. But, believe me, I say this with all seriousness: We too are disturbed by what is taking place there. Truly, we read with alarm in the press about the events in that oblast. It seems to me that what Academician Likhachev was saying today should somehow summon us somewhat to properly evaluate the situation. Truly, the situation arose completely unexpectedly for all of us. But, in my view it would be an absolutely proper decision in the sense that both the Armenian part of the populace and the Azerbaijan part of the populace should be represented. I am not acquainted with Zorkiy Balayan. As far as I know, he is my colleague, a physician, a journalist, who lives in Yerevan and works at LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Moscow. That is, there are no problems here at all. But it does seem to me that we should right now, in this growing crisis situation, take the proper decision. Academician Likhachev has just spoke well of

the role of culture in international relations; of public consciousness and of public tact. And so, are we not violating this tact by the fact that we manifest beforehand a certain lack of confidence in those candidates who were initially nominated? It seems to me that we should retain these two candidatures. And I as a women, as a person, who understands that behind this crisis situation there stands the actual fate, and perhaps even the lives of the people, call upon you to vote just so, displaying public tact. (Applause).

Nishanov: Comrade Sergey Aleksandrovich Ambartsumyan has the floor. (Applause).

S.A. Ambartsumyan, rector of Yerevan State University (Yerevanskiy-Myasnikyanskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Armenian SSR): Academician Likhachev spoke eloquent words about culture in general, and parliamentary culture as well, incidentally. And I think that any speech, whether prepared or unprepared, impromptu, should contain more culture. That is the first thing. Secondly, the congress has already decided to vote again. That decision was taken on a majority vote of the deputies. Plus the right of an autonomous oblast where there is today a special situation, and special rule, introduced by decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the Supreme Soviet Presidium. I consider interference by either the Azerbaijan republic or the Armenian republic, illegal. In the given situation, this question must be decided by the deputies from NKAO. I believe that the consultations which were held with the participation of Mikhail Sergeevich and other members of the presidium, in which we proposed to hold these consultations with the deputies from NKAO, have in essence led to a proposal such as that made by Comrade Pogosyan. I believe it would be natural for us to vote right now for the proposal made by NKAO. If you were to ask the opinion of the deputies from Armenia, we would propose something entirely different. But because this is an internal affair of the NKAO, we shall make no other proposals, and we advise the Azerbaijan SSR not to do so either. (Applause).

Nishanov: Comrades, perhaps, we can end the exchange of opinons on this? Let us go ahead and decide. Forgive me, please. Please sit down... After you others will come and other comrades will also say, "Let me speak." Please take your seats. We shall now take counsel. We have after all agreed, that we would decide by majority, but without oppressing the minority.

The question is truly a delicate one. We have spoken a great deal with the comrades and representatives from NKAO and the representatives of Azerbaijan and Armenia. Here Comrade Pogosyan has introduced a proposal. Perhaps we should vote on it? But in the sense that another secret ballot should be conducted, the question has already been decided. We have already voted the day-before-yesterday. And that question about a referendum, and so forth. Thesa are already outside the framework of our decision. I put it up for a vote.

From the audience: There is a proposal from a number of deputies to continue the discussion. (Inaudible).

Nishanov: Would you like to speak? Please. You come up; and you sit down please: sit here, please.

L.M. Veyser, Komsomol committee secretary, Masanchi Secondary School, Kazakh SSR, Dzhambul Oblast, Kurdayskiy Rayon, village of Masanchi (from the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth Society): Esteemed comrade deputies! I am a completely neutral person. I have served for more than four and a half years in the Transcaucasus, in the city of Leninakan, and I know the people of Azerbaijan extremely well. I have been to NKAO, and I know the friendly nation of Armenia extremely well; and here is what I want to say. Esteemed Comrade Deputies! Today, in voting for one or the other decision, we are deciding the fate of two fraternal republics. I consider it completely proper that among the deputies from NKAO there should be an Azerbaijani. Why? By electing two Armenians we thereby are provoking the Azerbaijanis to demonstrate. Here we must make a very well-reasoned decision, which would overturn the preceding secret ballot. I am categorically opposed to that.

Nishanov: It was not the presidium that took that decision, but the congress.

Veyser: You proposed that. I shall vote against it. With all respect to those sitting here, and knowing that right now both in NKAO and in the fraternal republics, Azerbaijanis and Armenians are listening to this speech, I want to appeal to you, comrades. Comrade Azerbaijanis, Comrade Armenians! A great request to you: Please, do not take offense at one another; for upon you, and your precipitate speeches, both on the part of Armenia, and on the part of Azerbaijan, depends... The people are there, you understand, and such a tense situation. One incautious word, and that is like touching a spark to a powder keg. That is all I have, comrades. (Applause).

Nishanov: Thank you. One moment. Please take your seat.

A.N. Krayko, department chief at the P.I. Baranov Central Institute of Aviation Engine Building (Baumanskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): (Noise in the hall).

Comrades, you all understand how complex is the situation in Azerbaijan. (Noise in the hall, applause). Look, I am not leaving. (Noise in the hall, applause). If I were going to propose something that had already been proposed, I would not have begun to speak.... (Applause). In my opinion, you should nevertheless listen.... (Applause).

Nishanov: Comrades, a moment. Patience. Let the deputy introduce his proposal and sit down.

From the audience: (Inaudible). (Noise in the hall).

Nishanov: Very well, sit down please. Why bother, if they do not want....

Krayko: I was given the floor.... (Noise).

Nishanov: One moment, a moment, patience.

Krayko: So. I believe we should make the following decision, which would satisfy everyone. And there is such a decision. Look, if instead of treating me with such disrespect you would treat the representatives of both sides that way, you would stop clapping, I would say.... I believe that we must find a decision which would permit all four to be in the Soviet of Nationalities. There is such a way out. Wait.... You see, there was the famous example of Sobchak and Denisov. I believe that all four persons should be put on the bulletin, and those who did not come with them. Moreover, I, for example, will vote for all four, because I do not consider it necessary to interfere in this dispute; and I hope, I believe—that if I were a member of the Supreme Soviet from the Soviet of Nationalities, I would decline my, so to speak, membership. I am sure that two persons will be found; and I hope that they will be Russians, who also decline such membership. The fact that anyone who lives in our country, in any republic, can be a representative here—that is an altogether different matter.

Nishanov: Comrade Starovoytova, you have spoken a great deal; please sit down for a minute, sit down please.

Ye.U. Kim, senior scientific associate, Omsk State University, Omsk (Sovetskiy Territorial Electoral District, Omsk Oblast): Comrades, here is my suggestion. Inasmuch as the Soviet of Nationalities' quota for NKAO is two people, and five people have been elected from the national-territorial district, plus Comrade Dadamyan from the social organization—obviously all six people could work in the Soviet of Nationalities on a rotating basis. Therefore, I propose: that all six of them should get together right now and make up a schedule of who would work in the Soviet of Nationalities and in which years. Do you understand? You see, here the situation inevitably arises that in the course of one year two Armenians will be working together, well, say Comrades Balayan and Grigoryan; then next year, Pogosyan and Grigoryan; and for still another year, let's say, Comrades Dzhafarov and Balayan would work. Comrade Volskiy was also elected from the national-territorial district. Right? Do you understand? Perhaps he too could work there. That's what I think; that if, you see, everything were scheduled this way, agreed in advance, then no one would be slighted. You understand, after all, that it is not important just who enters the Soviet of Nationalities right now. In a year or two, they will work there in the very same "bunch." And that is my proposal.

Nishanov: Comrades, just a minute please. Comrade Starovoytova, I respect you very much, and I do not want to insult you. But, by the audience reaction, you must sense.... You have already spoken twice, and here hundreds of deputies have not yet come to the rostrum once.... You must respect the congress. Please, sit down. (Applause).

Comrades, Deputy Kobzon is submitting a proposal that the commission continue its work. Just a minute, please, comrades. I will also explain. Do you want to add something? Please.

I.D. Kobzon, artist of Moskontsert, Moscow (from the USSR Trade Unions): Comrades! I have been to NKAO. It was the first concerts after the crisis there, which began last year. I met with workers in all rayons and with comrades from the Special Administration Committee. I do not know who deprived the Committee and the representatives of these two nations today of deciding the given problem. I believe that there is still another potential opportunity not used for solving the crisis which has come up on this question, this problem: We should now invite the elders [aksakaly] from both sides and have a talk with them. Depending upon what they propose in this situation—either to adopt the suggestion, if reasonable, which they express, or continue the consultation. Otherwise we will now once again adopt a hasty decision. Let them continue consultations on this acute national problem.

Nishanov: Comrades, a moment, one moment please. Comrade Volskiy is asking for the floor.

A.I. Volskiy, chairman of the Special Administration Committee, Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, a CPSU Central Committee department chief, of Moscow (Stepanakert Territorial District, Azerbaijan SSR): Dear comrades! I permit myself to speak to the "Other" category on the agenda, to describe those problems and perhaps certain proposals which we have worked out, working for a year already in Nagornyy Karabakh by your authority, being a representative of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet. And now I would ask you to hear me out for two minutes.

The situation in NKAO is very complex, and it is not homogeneous. Since 3 May strikes have been going on in Nagornyy Karabakh. There are daily clashes on an inter-ethnic basis. Emotion has the upper hand over reason literally everywhere. All appeals, all requests, talks with the aksakals and elders, are thus far not yielding the desired result. But there is are hopeful prospects: certain proposals are being worked out in the republics—both in one and the other. But you see right now, with the heated emotions of today, it would only cause harm. I can say this unequivocally. Certain rayons of Azerbaijan as well as Armenia have been boiling for two days not, and not even of their own will. It has not been peaceful in NKAO, neither today nor yesterday, especially after these debates. Everyone accepted the decision of the congress to cancel the elections for NKAO as an absolutely sensible decision. Why were they cancelled? I want everyone to understand. The situation

was like this. When the NKAO delegation got together, the comrades in the Special Administration Committee spoke out for Comrade Dzhafarov to become a part of the corps of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and be elected to the Soviet of Nationalities, an Azerbaijani I stress; and Comrade Pogosyan, former, NKAO party first secretary. These proposals were practically unanimously worked out among the NKAO deputies. I consider them exceptionally sensible. Everyone was in complete unanimity and agreed. But later, for some reason, the candidature of Pogosyan was switched for the candidature of Comrade Gabrielyan, first secretary of the Mardakertskiy Rayon Party Committee. By morning we had already received the list, in which new candidatures were inserted, without considering the opinion of the meeting of the NKAO deputies (That is, the candidature of Gabrielyan and Dzhafarov). You have held it in our hands. Dzhafarov had always, under all circumstances, remained. I do not understand the emotion of Vagiv Dzhafarovich Dzhafarov. He had always, under all circumstances, remained. This caused a reaction in the NKAO delegation, why we had not been considered. There was Pogosyan, Gabrielyan came, and so on. After this, a meeting was held, a rather emotional one, among the delegation. They put forth the following idea: Since you have not consulted with us, that means there will be the candidature of Comrade Balayan and Comrade Pogosyan, without the candidature of Dzhafarov. This emotional outburst came on the first day after the distribution of the lists.

Then I must say that Mikhail Sergeevich and Comrade Lukyanov displayed their wisdom and met with both delegations of NKAO and Azerbaijan. Anatoliy Ivanovich met with them separately once more; yesterday there were talks once again, separately; and today, once again separate talks. At last, a certain rather fragile equilibrium was established: to offer up for your judgment, for your verdict, three candidatures; those which had been introduced and not examined here. I must certify that Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov did not put up to a vote the question which Nagornyy Karabakh introduced. This is the fault of the chairmanship. I believe that under these circumstances it was necessary to vote.

Today there is an opportunity to take a sensible approach on all three candidates. I have in mind, that if one appeals to a sense of order, in three months ask the comrades, at the next session let's say, to accept one more seat. But there is also another way. If they do not want that, then it will be necessary to vote, to vote calmly, and to weigh what we are all saying. But now, I beg you, do not continue the discussion. We are being watched by both Nagornyy Karabakh, and Azerbaijan, and Armenia. Every careless word could once again be turned against the women, the children, the old people, against the entire population. Every careless word. I beg of you, not to continue the discussion on this subject. (Applause).

Nishanov: Dear comrades! In sum, one proposal stands out, the one introduced by Comrade Pogosyan: Include three candidates on the list for secret balloting. Whoever is in favor of this proposal, I ask you to prepare your mandates and vote. Please lower your hands. Who is opposed? The counters will now report. But seven [hands] are still visible from the presidium.... Voting against were 17 deputies. Who has abstained? I request you count them, comrades... Abstaining were 99 deputies.

Nishanov: Comrades! Thus, the candidatures of Comrades Pogosyan, Dzhafarov, and Balayan shall be included in the bulletin for secret balloting. It is proposed to hold the secret balloting this evening, after the session is over. I ask the counting commission to make all necessary preparations for voting, and to assemble at this time in the Granovitaya Chamber. And one more announcement: the comrades are requesting a meeting of the Mandate Commission during the lunch break. You may now come to an agreement in the Granovitaya Chamber. Please, you make the announcement yourselves, so that there won't be any false rumors.

Gidaspov: I beg the pardon of the deputies. We must assemble the Mandate Commission. There are already a number of questions that must be examined. Therefore, after our plenary session is over, all members of the Mandate Commission are requested to meet in the Supreme Soviet Presidium building, in the Small Hall.

Nishanov: Very well.

Gidaspov: I would like very much for Vladimir Pavlovich Orlov and Anatoliy Valeryanovich Gorbunov to take part in the session of the Mandate Commission, as we agreed. And I ask that the deputy chairmen and secretaries, and Comrade Yakovlev come to me.

Nishanov: Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov has the floor for a brief announcement.

Vorotnikov, V.I., member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, from Moscow (Voronezh National-Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): Comrades, I request that the members of the Supreme Soviet—both the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Russian Federation, including Moscow and Leningrad—remain here in the hall for a few minutes for information, after intermission is called.

Nishanov: Comrades, an intermission is declared until 1600.